

Remarks

In order to more clearly define the invention, Claims 22, 24, 33 and 38 have been amended.

This invention relates to a method and system for processing user requests for credit based network access. The invention receives, in an access point, a parameter having a credit value indicative of a length of available continued network access. Nowhere is the invention shown or suggested in the cited art, taken either singly or in combination.

Cited US 2004/0193513 to Pruss et al, shows a cellular network which provide prepaid billing for network services. Nowhere does Pruss et al show or suggest:

“said access port receiving an access response authenticating said credit-based network access, said access response containing a parameter having a credit value indicative of a length of available continued network access based on remaining user credit”,

as specifically recited in Claim 22 as amended. Nowhere does Pruss et al show or suggest any access port, since Pruss et al relates to a cellular network. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 22 as amended is not affected by Pruss et al.

Cited US 2003/0157925 to Sorber et al also relates to a cellular network, and does not show or suggest any access port. It is therefore clear that even if the structure of Pruss et al were to be combined with the structure of Sorber et al, the patentability of Claim 22 as amended would not be affected.

Claims 23-26 are dependent from Claim 22 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 22.

Similarly, nowhere does either Pruss et al or Sorber et al show or suggest:

“an access port receiving user credentials associated with said user request for credit based network access”, and

“forwarding said access response message to said access port”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 33 as amended. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 33 as amended is not affected by Pruss et al and Sorber et al.

Claims 34-36 are dependent from Claim 33 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 33.

Similarly, nowhere does either Pruss et al or Sorber et al show or suggest:

“said access point is responsive to an access response message containing a parameter having a value indicative of remaining user credit”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 37. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 37 is not affected by either Pruss et al or Sorber et al.

Claim 27 is dependent from Claim 37 and adds a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 37.

Similarly, nowhere does either Pruss et al or Sorber et al show or suggest:

“said authentication server transmits to an access point an access response message containing a parameter having a value indicative of a

length of available continued network access based on an indicator of remaining user credit”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 38 as amended. It is therefore clear that the ability of claim 38 does not affected by either Pruss et al or Sorber et al.

Claims 28 to 30 are dependent from Claim 38 and add further advantageous features. I submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 38.

The Applicants believe that this Amendment incurs no fee. However, if any fee is due, the Applicants request that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Sachin Satish Mody,
Saurabh Mathur,
Charles Chuanming Wang

/Daniel E. Sragow/

By: Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 161109